

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended without prejudice to generally include the features of now-canceled claim 9.

As for the Statutory Subject matter rejection, claim 1 has been amended without conceding the merits of the rejection to expressly recite an electronic application program *that cooperates with at least one configured multi-purpose electronic processor, and electronic or magnetic memory*. We ask that this rejection be removed.

As for the §112 rejection, the specification – including some of the incorporated by reference materials – provide suitable written description support. For example, please see the reference to the “normal” black and white scanners with “typical” photometric spectral response curves.

As for the art-based rejection of former claim 9, we respectfully traverse the notion of combining Sheng with Stephany. For example, there is no suggestion of success for such a combination. Moreover, the Office Action uses the conclusion (e.g., combining) as the motivation for combining. This circular approach goes against the well-established principles of obviousness. See, e.g., KSR.

Claim 1 also recites: *“the plural-bit data comprises or links to information which limits the number of times the electronic version of the document may be accessed.”* These features, in combination with other features of the claim, are not understood to be rendered obvious by Sheng and Stephany.

We look forward to our upcoming interview. In the meantime, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By: /Steven W. Stewart, Reg. No. 45,133/
Steven W. Stewart
Registration No. 45,133

Date: May 28, 2009

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800

FAX: 503-469-4777